

2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 05/08/2021 10:47:34 AM

1. Department or Agency		2. Fiscal Year	
Department of Health and Human Services		2021	
3. Committee or Subcommittee		3b. GSA Committee No.	
Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel		796	
4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	02/26/1992		
8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date	
No			
9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?	
Continue	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	
11. Establishment Authority	Authorized by Law		
12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effective Date	14. Committee Type	14c. Presidential?
42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16)	11/20/1985	Continuing	No
15. Description of Committee Special Emphasis Panel			
16a. Total Number of Reports	No Reports for this FiscalYear		
17a. Open 0	17b. Closed 0	17c. Partially Closed 0	Other Activities 0
17d. Total 0			
Meetings and Dates			
No Meetings			

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$0.00	\$0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary ...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts. This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and/or contract proposal in the fields of biomedical and behavioral science. Operation of this committee is accomplished using a fluid membership with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 26,752 applications requesting \$26,254,987,850.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

This committee has a fluid membership with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. The reviewers for each meeting are selected to evaluate grant applications or contract proposals for a specific, perhaps narrow, expertise area. Participants for each meeting are assembled to most efficiently and effectively cover the number and breadth of applications or contracts requiring review.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel held 864 meetings during this reporting period. The flexibility in review allowed by this committee structure has proved both efficient and effective.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications and proposals requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The meetings of the Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel were closed to

the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552(c)(4) and 552(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussions could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

21. Remarks

This committee did not produce any public reports during the fiscal year. Daily salary costs have been estimated for DHHS Federal members of this committee. The dollar figure represents a portion of their annual salary. No funds have been transferred between the committee and the agency. No additional funds are paid to Federal employees due to membership of this committee. Due to the assignment of responsibilities within the Center, the roles of committee designated federal officer and committee decision maker are filled by the same individual. Due to the larger number of members serving on this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide additional information on Occupation or Affiliation. Additional information on an individual's affiliation may be obtained by contacting the designated federal officer listed in this report.

Designated Federal Officer

John Bowers Division Director

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
CLINE, J.	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Daviau, Judith	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
FERRERA, VINCENT	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
HAVILL RYAN, DIANA	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	STRATEGIC RESEARCH PLANNING CONSULTANT	Peer Review Consultant Member
Hyder, Dewan Syed	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
KUEHL, THOMAS	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	PROFESSOR AND RESEARCH CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Klinger, Mark	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	Director and Clinical Professor of	Peer Review Consultant Member
LASALLE, BERNARD	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS	Peer Review Consultant Member
Mitchell, Robert	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR ADMINISTRATION	Peer Review Consultant Member
NEWSOME, JOSEPH	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPT OF PATHOLOGY	Peer Review Consultant Member
Norris, Karen	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Novak, Melinda	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
O'Sullivan, M.	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Orchard, Elysse	09/28/2020	10/01/2020	Attending Veterinarian	Peer Review Consultant Member

Sanders, Garrett 09/28/2020 10/01/2020 EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT (RETIRED)

Peer Review Consultant
Member

THOMANN, WAYNE 09/28/2020 10/01/2020 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Peer Review Consultant
Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 16

Narrative Description

The goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold. The NIH mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. The Center for Scientific Review (CSR) is the portal for NIH grant applications and their review for scientific merit. CSR receives about 80,000 applications a year. The majority of those grant applications (70%) are reviewed by peer review committees managed by CSR. Since 1946, our mission has remained clear and timely: to see that NIH grant applications receive fair, independent, expert, and timely reviews -- free from inappropriate influences -- so NIH can fund the most promising research. NIH advisory councils provide a second level of peer review and make funding recommendations based on priorities set by Congress, DHHS, and the public. For over 60 years, this peer review system has enabled NIH to fund cutting-edge research that has allowed millions to leave their doctor's office with new drugs and cures for diseases. This committee is responsible for determining the scientific and technical merit of applications based on the type of science, unique program emphasis, possible conflict of interest, or other factors that would or appear to compromise the review process if they were assigned to one of CSR's Initial Review Groups. This committee operates using a fluid membership, with individuals designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

Improvements to health or safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Unable to Determine | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Under \$100,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Over \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cost Savings Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

413,846

Number of Recommendations Comments

Grant Review

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

The mission of the Center for Scientific Review is to provide the funding Institutes and Centers of NIH with the scientific and technical merit of research grant applications submitted to the NIH. It is these Institutes or Centers and their advisory councils that make funding decisions. NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory

Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be funded.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

The mission of the Center for Scientific Review is to provide the funding Institutes and Centers of NIH with the scientific and technical merit of research grant applications submitted to the NIH. It is these Institutes or Centers and their advisory councils that make funding decisions. NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be funded.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

Oral and written reports.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

An action of “approved” or “recommended” for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH’s funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant’s management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval 26,752

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 26,752

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$26,254,987,850

Grant Review Comments

Grant Review

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO ☒

Online Agency Web Site ☒

Online Committee Web Site ☒

Online GSA FACA Web Site ☒

Publications ☐

Other ☐

Access Comments

N/A